Director Ryan greeted each of the Employee Organizations separately and addressed the below agenda items.

AZCPOA

Attendees: CO II Darren Sikes, ASPC-Lewis, represented AZCPOA. Also present from ADC were Director Charles L. Ryan, Interim Deputy Director Greg Lauchner, Carson McWilliams, Division Director of Offender Operations, Brad Keogh, General Counsel, and Timothy Rhyne, Chief Human Resources Officer. Natalie Poff was present to take minutes.

SUBMITTED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

On behalf of AZCPOA, the following questions were submitted in advance:

Question 1 –What was the conclusion of the Morey Unit Incident when TSU had to be called?

<u>Answer 1</u> – Cell Block 1 was coming out for chow when the Sergeant was having a conversation with an inmate in reference to clothing; the inmate put his hand in the Sergeant's face and at that time, ICS was initiated to restrain the aggressive inmate. The inmate then charged at the Sergeant and began swinging. The inmate was taken to the ground in the area of the pass through gate, after he was on the ground being restrained; two inmates rushed the gate and tried to push their way through the staff that responded to assist the Sergeant.

Chemical agents were deployed and when one of the inmates was being removed from the ground, he began swinging at two staff. At that time, additional inmates rushed in and began assaulting multiple staff members.

Of the eight (8) staff involved, six (6) returned to work and are doing well.

Eight inmates were involved. All received disciplinary and were sent to either enhanced or restrictive housing. Two (2) inmates have since been released.

The case has been submitted for review with the Maricopa County Prosecutor's Office.

AZCPOA asked why the inmate had attacked the Sergeant.

Carson McWilliams stated that the aggressive inmate was angry due to a property issue.

AZCPOA acknowledged that inmates get very upset when property is unavailable. In reference to such issues, AZCPOA stated that Officers, including those of whom are posted at Mail and Property, are being posted in different locations as a result of the

implementation of the 12-hour shifts. An example of this is when a food truck waited for 45 minutes at the sally port before an Officer was available to allow entry. Attempts were made to contact that post to notify the Officer that a truck was waiting at the sally port; however, those attempts were unsuccessful.

Director Ryan advised when staff do not get a response, employees should go up the chain of command until communication is made.

Director Ryan stated that the COTA curriculum is being revised to focus on motivational interviewing, and managing behavior. In turn, the Department can avoid issues and reduce staff assaults by engaging inmates without aggression and handling matters professionally.

Question 2 – What brought on the Winslow staff assault and how is the officer doing?

Answer 2 – COII Mayer was at the door of cell 3-C-223 at the assigned housing location of inmates Rodriguez and Velasquez. COII Mayer was engaged in a verbal exchange with inmate Rodriguez through the closed cell door when inmate Velasquez (who was not in the cell) confronted COII Mayer and tried to get him to open the cell door. When COII Mayer refused to open the cell door, inmate Velasquez began to strike COII Mayer multiple times with closed fists to the face and head. COII Mayer fell to the ground and inmate Velasquez continued striking him with closed fist strikes and kicks. Inmate Cruz, who was close by, turns to COII Mayer and begins to aggressively strike COII Mayer with closed fists and kicks. Within seconds inmate Arguello joins in the assault delivering kicks to COII Mayer then inmate Medina runs from the bottom floor up to join in by kicking and assaulting COII Mayer. The first staff member to arrive deployed chemical agents at the four inmates to create a path to recover and remove COII Mayer from the pod.

The officer is doing well. He was hospitalized due to sustaining injuries to his jaw and back. Due to those injuries he was transferred to Phoenix where he received care. He was transferred to a rehab center and received treatment. His spirits are up and he is focused on healing and has since returned home.

The four inmates involved were removed from the unit and are pending restrictive housing placement. All have been found guilty of assault on staff with serious injury. Winslow CIU is actively putting together a criminal case to submit to the Navajo County Attorney; they have agreed to pursue charges.

AZPOA stated when current or past staff pass away, it is publicized throughout the agency, but when staff are seriously injured or assaulted, the agency as a whole is not notified. AZCPOA stated that their employee organization offers assistance to staff who

have been seriously injured as well as their family members, if they, (AZCPOA) are aware of the need. AZCPOA asked if ADC staff can be notified when serious injuries and assaults occur.

Director Ryan stated that basic information will be communicated to ADC staff when serious injuries and assaults occur.

Question 3 – What is happening in Douglas?

Answer 3 – On August 27th, ICS was activated when approximately 200-300 Caucasian and Mexican American/Mexican National inmates grouped on north yard of Mohave Unit. Within a few minutes, Caucasian and Mexican American inmates began grouping on south yard. Approximately 300 inmates on both yards began fighting. TSU, SSU and DART, as well as other outside agencies were requested. The inmates destroyed buildings, fencing, signs, concrete benches, etc. on both yards. Mexican National and Native American inmates sided with Mexican Americans and the Mexican American inmates began throwing rocks and other items at staff. Six (6) staff were treated on site for injuries. Seventeen (17) Caucasian inmates were transported to the hospital for further treatment; two (2) were in critical condition. The inmates caused several thousand dollars wort of property damage, mostly in visitation area.

Caucasian inmates on the south yard returned to their housing units on August 28th. 81 Caucasian inmates on the north yard were transferred to Eggers Unit until interviews could be completed. 25 inmates were sent to CDU; and five (5) inmates were transferred to ASPC-Tucson.

Carson McWilliams stated that the Officers did a phenomenal job at taking control of the situation while mitigating injury to staff and other inmates. He advised that CIRT and onsite counseling services were provided for staff at ASPC-Douglas after the incident.

Question 4 – In all 3 of the above, staff were assaulted. What is being done about the assaults? What are the administration plans for dealing with the staff assaults?

<u>Answer 4</u> – Staff assaults are our major concern, safety is always the number one priority in Corrections. We have formed a focus group of staff from different complexes and of various ranks. The ADC group is recording data about the inmate, staff member, location, time, facility, etc. Once all the data is collected and mapped geographically, it will be analyzed to find root causes and ways to minimize assaults.

We have joined several other state correctional systems (California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Oregon) who are addressing staff assault issues also. So far, all are still in the data collection phase. We hope to have some results by early next year.

In the meantime staff should remain professional and consistent in dealing with inmates. This is our entire problem and if anyone has ideas they should submit them up the chain of command.

Question 5 – Rumor has it all of Lewis will be going to 12hr shifts, is there any truth to this?

Answer 5 – No, we have no plans to convert any more units to 12-hr shifts.

Question 6 – How much State/DOC money was given to the Lewis Sunrise Project?

<u>Answer 6</u> – ADC utilized non-appropriated monies for the Lewis Sunrise (Employment Center) Project. The one-time start-up and equipment costs were \$38,500. The Employment Centers utilize existing ADC and DES staff resources to deliver the services, as well as involving outside agencies and companies. There are no additional ongoing costs to ADC.

Director Ryan clarified that the reduction of recidivism is a priority breakthrough project. 63% of inmates come from Maricopa County and will likely recidivate there. We are looking at expanding re-entry centers and providing quality programming for inmates as one of several measures we are taking to reduce recidivism.

An A-3 CO II Retention Project is also underway to help improve employee retention which in turn will help the quality of available programming for inmates. Our issue is not hiring Officers; our issue is retaining Officers. On average, we lose Officers within 4.1 years.

AZCPOA stated that RUSH staff are misinforming Officers regarding ways to be transferred to the location of their choosing.

Director Ryan advised that the Officers can be put on a waiting list for their location of choice, or they can be placed on a rotation list. Director Ryan and Interim Deputy Director Greg Lauchner advised that RUSH staff will be redirected to ensure the accuracy of information shared.

ACA

Attendees: CO II Clinton Roberts, ASPC-Lewis, COII Wallace Davis, ASPC-Florence/Eyman, and CO II Scot Falcon, ASPC-Florence/Eyman represented ACA. Also present from ADC were Director Charles L. Ryan, Interim Deputy Director Greg Lauchner, Carson McWilliams, Division Director of Offender Operations and Brad Keogh, General Counsel. Natalie Poff was present to take minutes.

SUBMITTED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

On behalf of ACA, the following questions were submitted in advance:

Question 1 –What has been on everyone's minds is pay not just officers. What is the current pay package submitted by ADC to ADOA? Is there any proposed increase to vital support staff such as secretaries and maintenance staff?

Answer 1 – Employee compensation is and has been a priority for ADC. We will continue to aggressively explore opportunities. Ultimately, compensation is a state policy decision and we have no new information to share.

Question 2 — Meetings- There are morning meetings, Warden, Deputy Warden, Supervisor meetings to let the administration know what is going on with the unit or complex to pass down directives to subordinates. Briefing was that time for the Officers to get the vital information and to get a small amount of training from the Sergeants and Lieutenants. On the 12 hour shifts without causing a large impact hold a briefing on the short weeks. For example: on a Tuesday and Thursday of the short weeks?

Answer 2 — Given the current staffing levels and amount of OT being used, adding in any briefing time to the units on 12 hr shifts would create a large impact to the available funds used to fill CO positions. By adding in .25 for briefing it cost ADC approximately \$350,000 annually. It is recognized that briefings do provide for the transfer of vital information and for some limited training. What needs to be done now is for supervisory staff to prepare a briefing document that contains the information that was previously provided in briefings that can be taken from post to post for staff to read and discuss with the supervisor. The RODs will be directed to ensure that this is taking place. Additionally, video monitors have been purchased and are being installed at units that will provide agency wide updates and information that all staff should be aware of.

ACA stated the read and sign books are not working well. All staff are not reading the briefing logs, but are signing, acknowledging they have. Officers need briefing time to

not only ensure everyone is on the same page, but they also need that time to build camaraderie.

Carson McWilliams stated that when you start pulling staff for briefing results in additional overtime which is very costly. Additionally, by bringing back briefing time, those of whom work 12-hour shifts will have to work even longer hours which may impose hardships on them and their families. The point of the read and sign rosters, is that Supervisors are supposed to meet with their staff to go over the day's events to ensure staff are up to speed. We are looking at buying tablets and installing them in stationary areas for Officers on 12-hour shifts to help with briefing needs. The tablets may be their primary source of information.

ACA suggested that the tablet proposal be communicated using the Operations monitors at each of the complexes.

Question 3 – Staffing- In the past there was "D-Level" the yard was locked down for staffing issues except for necessity inmates such as kitchen. Then we had "mandating" for an additional 4 hours. From the last Meet and Confer has there been a change in staffing? From what it seems staffing is getting worst. Has there been any incite from the survey?

Answer 3 – The last Meet and Confer was on June 16, 2017. CO Staffing levels as of June 13, 2017 showed a 12.20% vacancy rate with 812 CO positions vacant. There has been no appreciable change since then. CO staffing levels as of September 11, 2017 remained at 12.20% vacancy with 813 CO positions vacant.

398 CO IIs responded to the survey. All who responded had 2-15 years of service and representing all ten prisons.

- Top three factors to stay with ADC were benefits, retirement and steady paycheck.
- 80% have considered quitting
- Top reasons for considering quitting was low pay, supervisor treatment and low staffing
- What is needed in order to stay at ADC is pay increase, improved supervisor treatment and staffing increase

Carson McWilliams added that a formal Field Training Officer (FTO) program for Sergeants will be developed and implemented to improve the supervisor treatment issue identified in the CO II Retention breakthrough project survey.

Question 4 – Grievances- with an 80 hour suspension the staff member is not allowed on prison grounds during their suspension. How would a staff member grieve their suspension within time frames when they are not allowed on prison grounds during their 80 hour suspension. The time frames are exhausted. I propose that attachment B be changed to reflect an 80+ hour suspension. Given 48 business hours upon completion of the said suspension.

517.09 TIME FRAMES

1.1 Employees shall adhere to the time frames listed in Attachment B of this Department Order for submitting and responding to grievances.

Answer 4 – Attachment B, states the grievant and immediate supervisor shall complete the "information resolution" attempt in a reasonable time frame, beginning either before or after the effective date of the action being grieved. With that being said, the employee can start the grievance process when they sign for their suspension letter. In the event the employee doesn't do this before they serve their suspension, they can submit an extension request to the individual who is responding at that step. These are the recommendations employees are advised of when they call Employee Relations.

Director Ryan clarified that employees have ten (10) days from the issuance of the suspension letter to grieve the disciplinary action. The Director and Interim Deputy Director Greg Lauchner advised the policy will be reviewed and the language concerning grievance time frames will be clarified.

Additional Information:

Director Ryan noted that he gives covered staff the opportunity to meet with him within three (3) days prior to dismissal. He further advised that he is the final ADC review authority for dismissals, and once approved, the recommendations to dismiss are submitted to the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA) for final approval.

Attendees: Senior Parole Officer Waldemar Mehner, Community Corrections, and Community Corrections Officer Rachel Underwood, Community Corrections, represented FOP. Also present from ADC were Director Charles L. Ryan, Interim Deputy Director Greg Lauchner, Carson McWilliams, Division Director of Offender Operations, Brad Keogh, General Counsel, and Timothy Rhyne, Chief Human Resources Officer. Natalie Poff was present to take minutes.

SUBMITTED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

On behalf of FOP, the following questions were submitted in advance:

Question 1 – QUESTION #1: INMATE DISCIPLINARY/LOP SANCTIONS

This question addresses a review of policy regarding disciplinary sanctions on open and walking four yards. Loss of privileges such as phones, store, and visitation, in conjunction with extra duty work assignments and mandatory class attendance, are highly effective for behavioral reform. However, one LOP sanction that is not effective is the loss of use of appliances. Reviewing this sanction, it is apparent that inmates on open yards and on walking four yards are easily circumventing this sanction. Open yards share appliances with one another, and walking four yards manipulate televisions and fans to be shared with the inmate housing next to them. Therefore, on paper, it seems a sanction was imposed, but in reality, it was ineffective.

This inmate sanction is manpower hour and labor intensive, collecting the appliances, only to return them a week later. Additionally, if equipment is damaged, the department is required to reimburse the inmate, making it a cost issue. Is the department open to reviewing the inmate sanction policy and doing away with this particular sanction, replacing it with one that would actually effect behavioral change?

Answer 1 – Accordingly, ADC's Inmate Disciplinary process as outlined in Department Order 803, endeavors to ensure penalties imposed on inmates are fair, reasonable and consistent with the severity of the violation. In as much as the Department strives to operate its prisons under conditions and yielding consequences as much like the real world as possible a Disciplinary Hearing Officer has an appropriate level of discretion in applying penalties. With regard to the Loss of Privilege (LOP) penalty and it application to inmate appliances it seem most appropriate that staff members discovering such manipulation(s) as describe in the question take enforcement action on the manipulation to ensure the LOP sanction is in fact in effect for the term of the penalty. The LOP penalty can be effective with an appropriate level of accountability to ensure

inmates are in compliance with the sanction through enforcement action of scofflaws who may attempt to circumvent the sanction.

Though the Department would not support removing LOP as a sanction option, as properly applied and enforced it has value, there is always interest in learning from employees of additional/alternative penalty options that may add value to the Inmate Disciplinary Process.

Carson McWilliams stated that the LOP is effective to a certain degree, but when that does not work, we can look at other sanctions.

Question 2 – QUESTION #2: EDUCATION SUPPLEMENT

Over the past few months/years, continuing education has been encouraged for promotion opportunities above grade 20 (Captains/COIV's). The current education supplement is only awarded to grade 20's and below with an approved degree. Is there anything current or in the plan for grade 21's and above to receive the education supplement after completing their degree?

<u>Answer 2</u> – Education Stipend eligibility is limited to selected employee classifications. CO III, CO IV, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, CCO, CCO Senior, and CC Supervisor are currently approved for the stipend. The Director recently approved the investigator and investigations supervisor series for inclusion in the approved classifications, and that request is being reviewed at this time by ADOA for final approval. There is no current plan to extend the stipend eligibility beyond the employee classifications identified above.

Director Ryan stated that the Department is currently working with the Arizona State University (ASU) on a Criminal Justice program, and the Department is looking for ways to enhance the tuition reimbursement program to make education more affordable and appealing to ADC employees. Currently, ADC employees are authorized to receive up to \$3,000 in tuition reimbursement annually.

Director Ryan advised that he will follow up with the Staff Development and Training Administrator Diane Rockett, Training Administrator Dr. Anne Hickling, and Education Development Program Coordinator Linda Tani regarding the ASU Criminal Justice program and tuition reimbursement.

Question 3 – QUESTION #3: FMLA

Why does the Intermittent FMLA approval at the Institution have to go through the Warden's office, not just the OHN when a Medical Doctor already stated it is needed? Why is it for only six months? Is intermittent FMLA for one year something that could be approved when a medical condition is not going to change or improve? It is frustrating and financially draining when an employee attempts to use their FMLA and it has expired, causing them to have to schedule an appointment with the doctor and pay the co-pay.

<u>Answer 3</u> – The Warden is the approving authority. The OHN's role is to receive the medical documentation, determine if the health condition is a qualifying event under the FMLA rule, then sign the form to acknowledge it is a qualifying event and forward the request for intermittent leave to the Warden with an indication of the estimated frequency and duration of the absences.

In accordance with section CFR 825.308 (b) (f) of the FMLA rules, even if the medical certification indicates that the employee will need intermittent or reduced schedule leave for a period in excess of six months (e.g., for a lifetime condition), the employer would be permitted to request recertification every six months in connection with an absence. Any recertification requested by the employer shall be at the employee's expense. This applies equally to all employees who request intermittent leave.

The employee should be fully aware of the dates of their FMLA leave. When the employee is approved for FMLA leave, the approval form indicates the expiration date of that approval. Therefore, if they anticipate the need for renewed or additional leave time, they should pro-actively begin the process to request additional leave, prior to the expiration date. The initiative by the employee to begin the process ahead of time, could allow them to better plan financially for any associated costs.

FOP stated they have a meeting with Senator Lesko on Thursday, September 21, 2017 to discuss employee retention, pay, morale etc. FOP asked Director Ryan if he would share information regarding the number of staff who are actively on FMLA and the number of employees who are currently on Military Leave to present to Senator Lesko as a means to give her an idea how many "boots on the ground" there are at the units.

Director Ryan advised that CHRO Timothy Rhyne can provide the FMLA and military information to Mr. Mehner to take to the legislative meeting on September 21st.

Director Ryan also suggested that Mr. Mehner contact Caroline Hack to obtain a call-in report.

Question 4 – QUESTION #4: HIRING SECURITY

Recently it was noticed that an employment announcement for a records clerk at central office encouraged former inmates to apply. Can it be explained why the Department would be placing ex-inmates into a position that they might have access to confidential information about other inmates/parolees or what special (if any) security precautions that the Department is taking with these proposed new employees?

Answer 4 – One of the hallmarks of Governor Ducey's Administration is the reduction of recidivism among inmates released from ADC into the community. Authoritative studies conclusively demonstrate that homelessness, unemployment, and drug addiction are three material factors affecting the likelihood of a released inmate reoffending and returning to prison. ADC joining with the Arizona Department of Housing, the Arizona Department of Health Services, the Department of Public Safety, State Forestry, and other State agencies in a collective effort to achieve a significant reduction in the recidivism rate.

Among other programs, ADC has designated a limited number of positions within the Department as potential opportunities for which certain former inmates may be eligible for consideration. The reference records clerk positions are entry-level positions which pay approximately \$20,000 annually. ADC has a robust evaluation protocol in place to address the necessary and appropriate security precautions. Only those former inmates who have not committed a disqualifying crime or disqualifying disciplinary infraction are eligible for consideration by senior management for these job opportunities.

Director Ryan advised that the Department is going to lead by example by hiring eligible released inmates to encourage other organizations, both private and public, to hire follow suit in an effort to reduce recidivism.

FOP asked if the program includes former inmates who are approved for interstate compact.

Interim Deputy Director Greg Lauchner advised that the program could potentially include former inmates on interstate compact.

FOP stated that staff were shocked when the saw the announcements which encouraged former inmates to apply.

Director Ryan clarified that work programs for released offenders is not a new concept and has been around for a number of years, that is why the Ex-Offender Waiver was put into place.

Question 5 – QUESTION #5: GEOGRAPHICAL STIPENDS

The ASPC Winslow Prison and the ADC staff at Kingman Private Prison receive at least 10% stipend with some staff in Winslow receiving a 15% stipend. The Northern Region Parole Offices are not receiving stipends. The amount of time it takes to fill a position in Northern Region Parole has been approximately 6 months, with many on the promotional roster not willing to take a position in Northern Region due to high cost of living and/ or losing their stipend. The most current promotional roster has no one listed with a geographical preference for the Northern Region. The current Senior Community Corrections Officer position has been vacant for the last 17 weeks. Why does the Northern Regional Parole Staff not have a stipend when they are showing the same difficulty in filling their positions?

Answer 5 – The decision was made by Northern Region Community Corrections Manager Kathryn Brown and Supervisor Armando Gonzalez that the position was not critical and that they preferred to await a new list. The interview portion of the process for the new list occurs next week and the list should be out shortly after that. This is why the Senior CCO position has experienced a delay in being filled.

Community Corrections Administration has been tasked by me to review all locations and determine if there have been or currently are delays in position being filled which are the result of a lack of interested/qualified applicants. They will submit a proposal to me for stipends to mirror those offered by the prisons if it is determined that this is the case at any of the CC office locations.

FOP stated ASU has a program for the Correctional Series; however, the Department does not offer tuition reimbursement for certificate programs.

Director Ryan advised that the Department is working with ASU to increase the number of programs offered which may qualify for tuition reimbursement. This is part of the path forward and progression planning.

Additional Information:

*Director Ryan sent an e-mail to all ADC staff on Monday, September 18th, at 2:01 p.m. regarding important benefit enrollment changes. Please note, information herein was not available at the time of the Meet and Confer meetings.

All ADC Employees,

The State of Arizona is planning important changes to the benefits plan for 2018. Please take a moment to read the attached document for details. If you have questions, please contact our agency benefits liaison, Diann Engstrom at 602-255-2451, or call a Benefit Options representative 602-542-5008, toll-free 800-304-3687, or by email at benefitsissues@azdoa.gov. You can also visit benefitoptions.az.gov for links to an FAQ document and Benefit Expos dates.

Wardens – let's ensure this information is shared on all shifts and at briefings for the next 3 days. Let's also have this information posted on employee bulletin boards. Be advised that the HR liaisons at the prison complexes will have participated in a webinar at 1:30PM this afternoon.

Let's be good communicators with all of our employees, as this will go into effect on January 1, 2018. Open Enrollment will be from October 30 to November 17, 2017.

Regards,

Charles L. Ryan
Director
Arizona Department of Corrections
Office 602-542-5225
FAX 602-364-0159
cryan@azcorrections.gov

Attached: Letter from Marie Isaacson - 2018 premium changes



Douglas A. Ducey Governor Craig C. Brown Director

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Benefit Services Division 100 NORTH FIFTEENTH AVENUE • SUITE 260 PHOENIX, ARIZONA \$5007 (602) 542-5008

To: Agency Directors

From: Marie Isaacson, Benefits Director

Date: September 18, 2017

RE: Important Rate Changes for 2018 Benefits

The Benefits Services Division's goal is to provide cost effective comprehensive benefits to all State employees, retirees, and their families. There are important changes being made this year which will impact all employees who elect State benefits.

While the State has worked hard to insulate employees from skyrocketing healthcare costs that have been felt throughout the public and private sectors, out of necessity there will be a change to premiums and copays. The benefit packages offered by the State of Arizona continue to be among the most competitive and attractive in both the private and public sectors.

We appreciate your help in distributing this memo to all your employees and directing any questions to your agency's benefits liaison, or to a Benefit Options representative, by phone 602-542-5008, toll-free 800-304-3687, or by email at benefits is sues@azdoa.gov.

Premium Changes for 2018					
Plan Type	Tier	2017 EE Cost/Paycheck	2018 EE Increase/Paycheck	2018 EE Cost/Paycheck	FY20 18 State Cost/Paycheck
Exclusive Provider Organization (EPO) Aetna, BCBSAZ, Cigna, UnitedHealthcare	EE only	\$18.46	\$1.85	\$20.31	\$285.88
	EE + Adult	\$54.92	\$5.50	\$60.42	\$587.38
	EE + Child	\$46.62	\$4.66	\$51.28	\$381.54
	Fam ily	\$102.00	\$10.20	\$112.20	\$643.54
Preferred Provider Organization (PPO) Aetna, BCBSAZ, UnitedHealthcare	EE only	\$47.08	\$4.70	\$51.78	\$290.58
	EE + Adult	\$99.23	\$9.92	\$109.15	\$614.42
	EE + Child	\$66.46	\$6.65	\$73.11	\$411.15
	Fam ily	\$115.85	\$11.58	\$127.43	\$716.81
Health Savings Account (HSA) Aetna	EE only	\$9.23	\$0.92	\$10.15	\$193.38
	EE + Adult	\$27.69	\$2.77	\$30.46	\$400.77
	EE + Child	\$23.54	\$2.35	\$25.89	\$262.00
	Fam ily	\$51.23	\$5.12	\$56.35	\$446.50

Close:

The Director encouraged the Employee Organizations to utilize the opportunities they have to communicate the questions and concerns of their members more frequently, including taking advantage of his open door policy. Director Ryan thanked those who were in attendance.

cc: Executive Staff

Wardens

Paul O'Connell

File